

Questions & Answers
Sunnyside Mobil
1806 W Court St, Janesville WI
53545-3418-06
03-54-099139

Is any drum containing soil cuttings/free product/contaminated water is stored on the site and needs to be disposed of?

There are no drums on site.

What is the purpose of coreholes?

Rock coring is a technique for determining the composition of rock and presence of fractures, among other things.

How many coreholes are existing?

Based on verbal communications, one corehole (CH-1) still exists with casing extending from within a couple feet below the bedrock surface to the surface through the unconsolidated surficial materials. The second corehole (CH-2) was abandoned after the casing was damaged.

What is the diameter and width of each corehole?

Based on verbal communications, the nominal diameter is 2 inches and the casing is 6 inches. [Corehole Boring Logs and Abandonment forms](#).

According to the report, tetrachloroethene (PCE) has migrated on the property from an other source. PCE, a chlorinated solvent, is a part of VOCs (8021). Will the PECFA pay for testing of VOCs?

Per Comm 47.30(4)(a), only costs associated with the eligible products may be claimed. PCE is not an eligible product for reimbursement by the PECFA fund.

What is the name of the bank for PECFA loan?

This information is currently unknown, as no claim has been audited.

Should the consultant be approved by the bank to participate in the bidding process and get the job after being successful?

There is no Commerce requirement that consultants must be approved by a bank to participate in the bid process.

An existing consultant is an unsuccessful bidder due to non-compliance of the bid. The owner wants to retain the existing consultant in spite of non-compliance of the bid. Will the department encourage to hire non-compliant bidders (previous consultants)?

Commerce prefers that the responsible party hire the consulting firm that submitted the winning bid. However, Commerce does not encourage or discourage claimants from hiring a particular consultant.

An existing consultant is an unsuccessful bidder due to higher cost as compared to the cost of successful bidder. The owner wants to retain the existing consultant. Will the department promote this process?

Commerce prefers that the responsible party hire the consulting firm that submitted the winning bid. However, at this time, the claimant can determine what PECFA-eligible consulting firm they will hire for the activities.

Will it be possible for the department to send a copy of the tabulated results at the same time the letter is sent to the successful bidder?

The tabulated bid results will be posted on the Internet shortly after the claimant is notified of the results.

It is suggested in the Site Investigation Report Addendum that contamination in monitoring well MW-20 does not appear to be from Sunnyside Mobil, and lists another potential off-site source (Green Rock FS Cooperative). Does the WDNR and DCOMM concur with the opinion that contamination from MW-20 is not from the Sunnyside Mobil site?

WDNR agrees that it appears the contamination in MW-20 has a source other than the Sunnyside Mobil site.

In the Site Investigation Report and Site Investigation Report Addendum, Janesville Brick N Tile and UTZIC Car Care are listed as potential sources of contamination and/or free product. It is also stated that the test pits dug as part of the remedial investigation for Janesville Brick N Tile may not have been close enough to the source area to detect vertical migration of contaminants to bedrock. Is the WDNR or DCOMM requiring or considering to require further investigation of either Janesville Brick N Tile or UTZIC Car Care?

At this time, WDNR has no plans to require further investigation at either Janesville Brick N Tile or UTZIC Car Care.

Commentary #1

MW-6 had as much as 7.61 feet of product in the fall of 1997. Since 1997, product thickness' in MW-6 have gradually diminished and the two most recent measurements did not detect any product. The screened portion of MW-6 appears to have been entirely underwater since the spring of 1998 when water levels rose by a couple feet across the site. This seems to be the case with many of the sandstone wells (screens entirely under water since spring of 1998), which leads to extreme uncertainty as to the validity of current and historic product thickness' in the sandstone, as well as an inability to effectively monitor product thickness in the future, unless water levels drop below the top of the screens.

Questions on commentary #1:

Do you agree with this assessment?

WDNR agrees that fluctuating water table elevations present a significant challenge to evaluating and remediating this site. It should be noted that the bidder may elect to include the installation of additional wells (beyond the two requested in the bid document) as part of their remedial strategy.

If not, why not?

Not applicable. See above.

If so, then will you reject bids that do not address product removal throughout the entire area in which product has been historically detected?

Bids will not be rejected solely on this basis.

Commentary #2

The minimum bid requirements specify being "... flexible enough to accommodate changing conditions."

Questions on commentary #2:

How is this done within the context of the PECFA bid process?

Free product has been documented regularly in MW15S but irregularly in other monitoring wells. It is also unknown if free product will be present in the two (2) additional monitoring wells. The successful bidder's remedial strategy must be flexible enough to recover free product at varying locations.

Are contingencies allowed in the bid? For example, provide a base bid for a specified scope, plus so much per additional unit of whatever treatment technology is proposed.

The "total cost through closure" or Total Cap Cost (1st Page of Bid Response) is does not allow for contingencies. A "change order" is not allowed unless there are "new developments" per Wisc. Stat. 101.143(3)(cs)4.

Commentary #3

The presence of product in sandstone at SB34 is unknown. The text made reference to product; however, no further information appears to be available as to why product is believed to be present. The boring log does not provide evidence of product. The minimum specifications call for adding a monitoring well in the sandstone at this location.

Questions on commentary #3:

Should the bid assume product does, or does not exist in the sandstone at this location.

Bid should assume that product is present in the area of SB34.

If the assumption as to product at SB34 for bidding purposes is incorrect (i.e. after installing the well, product is present or not, after assuming the opposite), will there be an appropriate adjustment to the bid price and PECFA cap?

Given the answer above and the answer regarding "new developments", an "adjustment" would be unlikely.

Additional comments, without corresponding questions

The cross-section A-A' appears to have several mistakes, if I'm interpreting the soil boring logs correctly. In the vicinity of MW-3 and MW-4, sandstone should be at an elevation of about 777 feet, not 787, and at MW15S, sandstone should be around 789 feet, not 777. This information could be important to the remediation, because it pertains to whether the upper few feet of the sandstone is saturated, or not. A couple minor labeling mistakes, on the same Figure 3, MW-15S is shown twice, once correctly as a monitoring well, and then a second time incorrectly at the location of SB34, and the orientation of A-A' as indicated by the labels on the elevation grids, is incorrectly listed as west to north. I assume this should be north to south.